

economists we have in the land, who predicted that we could create 13 million more jobs—13 million more jobs—with a Tax Code that encouraged investment, that encouraged savings, and that got us out of the business of punishing productivity and into the business of rewarding.

Michael Boskin, the former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Madam Speaker, said that the long-term gain to GDP from a consumption-based tax reform would be roughly 10 percent—a 10-percent change to GDP simply because we take away a punitive Tax Code and put in one that makes sense.

Madam Speaker, I don't know about families in your district; families in my district can't wait. Families in my district don't think the economy is going so great that it is okay if we shave off 10 percent at the top. We can do better and we must.

"Long-run GDP per capita would be 9.7-percent higher under a national sales tax," says Alan Auerbach at the University of California, Berkeley.

Time and time again, economists from the left and economists from the right come to the same conclusion: the power to tax is the power to destroy. Taxing income punishes and destroys productivity.

"Near-term 9- to 13-percent increase in the GDP," says Dale Jorgenson, the former chairman of the economics department at Harvard University.

There is a reason all of these different economists come together around the same figure, Madam Speaker, again, from the left and from the right. We have an opportunity to do better, if only we will agree.

Madam Speaker, it is #PassTheFairTax. The FairTax has more cosponsors—again, it is H.R. 25—more cosponsors than any other fundamental tax reform in this institution. On the Senate side, it has more cosponsors than any other fundamental tax reform bill on the Senate side.

Madam Speaker, the FairTax has supporters in every State across the Nation. It is not coming out of Washington, D.C.

Passing the FairTax would take away so much of the power that this town can exercise over people. We will give you a tax credit for buying an electric car, we will give you a tax credit for buying a windmill, we will give you a tax credit for having more children, and we will give you a tax credit for this, that, and the other. With the FairTax, all of those exceptions and exemptions go away. Hear that.

I started telling you about the amazing men and women who serve in this Chamber, folks who come to work every day to try to build a better America in cooperation with their bosses, their constituents back home.

We talk so often about how the Washington culture creates all these exceptions and exemptions and somebody is benefiting from it and some-

body is getting paid off for it. Non-sense.

There is one bill in this Chamber that abolishes every single special-interest exception, exemption, carveout, and credit in the entire United States Tax Code. That bill is the FairTax, and that bill has more support in this Chamber than any other fundamental tax reform bill in Congress.

Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity to do this together. We have an opportunity to build a better economy together. We have an opportunity to take the IRS out of every single one of our constituents' lives forever.

It is going to take a lot of courage. It is going to take a lot of courage to abolish all of those exceptions and exemptions. It is going to take a lot of courage to hit the reset clock on the American Tax Code. It is going to take a lot of courage to get out of the business of trying to be mediocre with the rest of the world and kind of settle right there in the middle and to move from the very worst Tax Code on the planet to the very best Tax Code on the planet.

Worst to first, Madam Speaker. That is what the FairTax offers. I ask the support from each and every one of my colleagues that has not yet cosponsored this bill.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1245

#### APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment pursuant to section 201(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431) and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the Commission on International Religious Freedom for a term effective May 14, 2016, and ending May 14, 2018:

Mr. Daniel I. Mark, Villanova, Pennsylvania

Ms. Kristina Arriaga, Alexandria, Virginia, to succeed Dr. Robert P. George

#### GREAT AMERICAN BATHROOM CONTROVERSY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the great American bathroom controversy.

On my right, this is a picture of someone who may or may not be recognizable to many Americans today. I will say her name. The name may be more recognizable to some. Her name is Christine Jorgensen.

Christine Jorgensen was born in 1926. She grew up in the Bronx, like I did. She went to high school at Christopher Columbus High School, which was near the public housing where I grew up in the Bronx. In fact, my father taught history at Christopher Columbus High School. I don't know whether he taught Christine or not, but it is possible.

In 1945, Christine was drafted and served in the U.S. military. Now, that may be a puzzle for some of you listening to me right now who say: I didn't realize that women were drafted in the 1940s. Well, at that time, Christine's name was George, George Jorgensen. That is the name she was born with.

She was, in fact, on her birth certificate male, something that she struggled with greatly all through the time that she was growing up—being a male—something that she struggled with being in the military, and then after leaving military service.

In 1951, she heard about the possibility of changing her gender. So she went to Denmark and underwent three or more surgeries, plus a very substantial amount of estrogen treatments, came back to the United States, and then forever thereafter, after 1953, was known as Christine Jorgensen.

Christine Jorgensen was out. She was well known in America as someone who was transgendered. I knew about her story when I was growing up in the 1960s and 1970s. She made no effort to hide. She didn't feel any shame about it.

In fact, she was proud of the fact that she had been able to take advantage of what medicine had to offer and live the life that she felt she would have been able to live from the beginning if she had the proper gender.

She had some degree of fame. Republican Vice President Spiro Agnew referred to her once in a speech to mock one of his political opponents. She performed both as a singer and as an actress all through the 1950s, through the entire 1960s, and well into the 1970s. She was the most famous, if you will, transgendered person in America probably to this day.

Now, I have to tell you I don't know exactly where she went when she had to go. I don't know exactly whether she went into a men's room or a ladies' room. But here is an interesting thing. Even though this is something new under the Sun, even though America never had to address this issue before, no one ever even bothered to ask.

I don't remember anybody saying "Christine Jorgensen ought to go to the men's room. She was born a male" or, for that matter, "Christine Jorgensen identifies as a female. She should go to the ladies' room."

Isn't it odd that America in the 1950s seems to have shown a lot more maturity than America is showing today with our great bathroom controversy right now, where the cisgendered people of America try to dictate to the transgendered people of America where